

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The official Office Action dated January 17, 2006, has been carefully considered. Claims 2-20 and 22-42 remain in the application. Claims 14 and 33 were rewritten in independent form. Claims 40 and 42 were amended. The status identifier of claims 9-12 and 28-31 has been changed to indicate that these claims are no longer withdrawn from consideration.

No new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments, full support therefore being shown in the drawings and specification as filed. All claims remaining in the application are believed to now be in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the referenced amendments and the following remarks.

Personal Interview Summary

The Applicants kindly thank the Examiner for the personal interview with the Applicants' representative on April 4, 2006. The Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for indicating, during the interview, that the claims as presently amended are allowed over the cited art of record. The Examiner also indicated that dependant claims 14 and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. During the personal interview, the Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the Applicants' independent claims in view of the cited art of record, with particular attention to the VanLandingham, Horwitz, Cress, and Bargar references.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-8, 13, 20, 22-27, 32, and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over either U.S. Patent No. 2,501,887 to Cress or U.S. Patent No. 2,320,133 to Horwitz in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,997,849 to Bargar. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the personal interview with the Applicants' representative, the Examiner acknowledged that these references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest an adjustable utensil carrier that is moveable between two positions to reorient the food contact surface of the utensil relative to the water spray assembly and the side spray assembly as called for and defined by the claims. As such, this rejection must fail.

Because claims 2-8, 13, 20, and 41 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 40, and claims 22-27, 32, and 39 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 42, these claims are for the same reasons patentable over either Cress '887 or Horwitz '133 in view of Bargar '849.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims in the application are allowable over the prior art of record. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
JAY C. LANDSIEDEL ET AL.

Dated: April 12, 2006

By: /Mark A Davis/
Mark A. Davis, Reg. No. 37,118
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
McGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0221864